



General Assembly

Sixtieth session

Official Records

Distr.: General
09 December 2005

Original: English

Third Committee

Summary record of the 46th meeting

Held at Headquarters, New York, on Tuesday, 22 November 2005, at 10 a.m.

Chairman: Ms. Carvalho (Vice-Chairman). (Portugal)
later: Mr. Butagira (Chairman). (Uganda)

Contents

Agenda item 71: Human rights questions (*continued*)

- (b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (*continued*)
- (c) Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives (*continued*)

This record is subject to correction. Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

05-61402 (E)



In the absence of Mr. Butagira (Uganda), Ms. Carvalho (Portugal), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

The meeting was called to order at 10.20 a.m.

Agenda item 71: Human rights questions (continued)

(b) Human rights questions, including alternative approaches for improving the effective enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms (continued) (A/C.3/60/L.32, L.37/Rev.1, L.56/Rev.2 and L.71)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.32: Establishment of a United Nations human rights training and documentation centre for South-West Asia and the Arab region

1. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) said it was the understanding of the Secretariat that voluntary contributions would be sought to cover the resource requirements for the establishment of the Centre. Therefore, if the General Assembly adopted the draft resolution, no additional appropriation would be required.
2. He also announced that the Marshall Islands had been erroneously listed as a sponsor of the draft resolution.
3. **Mr. Al-Thani** (Qatar), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that Armenia, Belgium, France, Germany, Italy, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom and the United States of America had joined the sponsors.
4. The text of the draft resolution had been revised with the insertion of the phrase "the endorsement of the Vienna Declaration and Programme of Action of 1993 of" after the word "Reaffirming" in the sixth preambular paragraph; the deletion of the word "standards" from the seventh preambular paragraph; and the insertion of "human rights" after "international" in paragraph 2.
5. **The Chairman** said that the following countries wished to sponsor the draft resolution: Albania, Australia, Austria, Brazil, Burkina Faso, the Central African Republic, the Comoros, Croatia, Cyprus, the Czech Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, the Dominican Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, the Netherlands, Panama, Paraguay, Peru,

the Republic of Moldova, Romania, Sierra Leone, Slovakia, Slovenia, Sri Lanka, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste and Ukraine.

6. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.32, as orally revised, was adopted.*

7. **Mr. Alaei** (Islamic Republic of Iran) said that while his delegation had been willing to join the consensus on the draft resolution, it wished to dissociate itself from the twelfth preambular paragraph.

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.37/Rev.1: Protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms while countering terrorism

8. **The Chairman** said that the draft resolution contained no programme-budget implications.

9. **Mr. Alday González** (Mexico), speaking on behalf of the sponsors, said that they had been joined by Armenia, Egypt, Italy, Japan, Monaco, Paraguay, Peru, Romania, Serbia and Montenegro, Switzerland, the United States of America and Uruguay.

10. Paragraph 11 of the draft resolution had been revised to read: *Stresses* that, while developing, as agreed at the World Summit, a strategy to promote comprehensive, coordinated and consistent counter-terrorism, full consideration should be given throughout the process to the protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms and to the provisions of humanitarian law and international refugee law."

11. In paragraph 15, the word "*Welcomes*" should be replaced by "*Takes note with interest of*"; and in paragraph 16, the phrase "*Also welcomes*" should be replaced by "*Takes note with appreciation of*", together with the deletion of the phrase "takes note of" in that paragraph.

12. **The Chairman** said that Angola, Bolivia, El Salvador, Iceland and New Zealand had also joined the sponsors.

13. **Mr. Cumberbatch Miguén** (Cuba), speaking in explanation of his delegation's position, expressed reservations about the revisions read out by the representative of Mexico, which showed that the United Nations was far from having a finalized counter-terrorism strategy. The only elements in the strategy currently available had been identified by the Secretary-General at the start of the year, a fact which should have been clearly reflected in the text of the

draft resolution. The revised text should in no way prejudice the results of the negotiations under way in the Sixth Committee or affect the delicate balance achieved on the issue of terrorism at the 2005 World Summit. Given the many factors involved in the fight against terrorism, Cuba would oppose any attempts to impose a selective and unilateral vision contrary to international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

14. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.37/Rev.1 was adopted.*

15. **Ms. García-Matos** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) said that, while her delegation had been able to support the consensus, it had not sponsored the draft resolution, because it rejected the 2005 World Summit outcome document. It therefore had reservations about paragraph 11 of the draft resolution, whose reference to the agreement entered into at the 2005 World Summit could promote recognition of the outcome document. Her delegation also rejected the revisions announced by the representative of Mexico and said that the issue of terrorism should continue to be addressed by the Sixth Committee.

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.56/Rev.2: Protection of and assistance to internally displaced persons

16. **Mr. Khane** (Secretary of the Committee) drew attention to the amendment in document A/C.3/60/L.71 and said that draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.56/Rev.2 would not entail any additional appropriation.

17. **Ms. Merchant** (Norway) said that, speaking on behalf of the sponsors, in the third preambular paragraph of the draft resolution, after the words "internally displaced persons", the phrase "including in long term displacement situations", should be inserted. In addition, in the fifth preambular paragraph, after "durable solutions", the phrase "inter alia, for long term displacement situations" should be deleted. She announced that Bulgaria and Peru had joined the sponsors.

18. **The Chairman** said that Brazil, the Congo, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Timor-Leste and Togo had also joined the sponsors of the draft resolution, as orally revised.

19. **Ms. Adjalova** (Azerbaijan) announced that the amendment in document A/C.3/60/L.71 had been withdrawn.

20. **Mr. Marsh** (United States of America) welcomed the draft resolution and joined others in deploring practices of forced displacement in violation of international law. However, his delegation had technical concerns about the language used in the tenth preambular paragraph, which contained an incomplete description of conduct in relation to the deportation, displacement and transfer of persons under the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. For example, the paragraph in question failed to specify that the deportation or forcible transfer of a population was a crime against humanity when taken without grounds permitted in international law. The paragraph also omitted to mention that the displacement of the civilian population was not a war crime when required for the security of the civilians involved or for imperative military reasons. Both those qualifications were included in the Rome Statute and in international humanitarian law.

21. The tenth preambular paragraph could not change — or be viewed as changing — the elements necessary for conduct to constitute a crime under the Rome Statute or a violation of applicable legal standards. Subject to that understanding, his delegation was pleased to join the consensus on the draft resolution.

22. *Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.56/Rev.2, as orally revised, was adopted.*

23. **Mr. Malhotra** (India) said that the issue of internally displaced persons belonged firmly to the humanitarian arm of the United Nations system and he welcomed the fact that the Committee had confined its consideration of that issue to the human-rights situation of such persons.

24. His delegation had reluctantly accepted the reference in paragraph 17 to the relevance of the global database on internally displaced persons. However, unless immediate steps were taken to update the information contained in there, his delegation might not be able to accept such references in future.

25. **Ms. Halabi** (Syrian Arab Republic) said that, while her delegation had joined the consensus in order to draw attention to the situation of internally displaced persons, it also wished to express its reservations concerning the references to the Guiding Principles on Internal Displacement in the sixth and eleventh preambular paragraphs and in paragraphs 8 and 9 of the draft resolution.

(c) **Human rights situations and reports of special rapporteurs and representatives** (*continued*)
(A/C.3/60/L.51)

Draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.51: Situation of human rights in Uzbekistan

26. **The Chairman** said that draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.51 contained no programme-budget implications. He drew attention to a number of revisions made to the text at the 37th meeting.

27. **Mr. Jones Parry** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the members of the European Union and the other sponsors listed, as well as Australia, Andorra, Bulgaria, Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, Palau, Serbia and Montenegro and Switzerland, said that, in paragraph 5, the word "sixty-second" should be replaced by "sixty-first".

28. While the European Union welcomed the steps taken by the Government of Uzbekistan, it remained gravely concerned by the events that had occurred in Andijan in May 2005. The draft resolution therefore called on the Government to allow an independent, external inquiry into those events and to accede to the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. The sponsors urged the Government to cooperate with the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, the Special Rapporteur on torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the International Committee of the Red Cross. His delegation had invited the Uzbek delegation to engage with it in discussions of the draft resolution and stood ready to work with Uzbekistan to promote full respect for human rights.

29. The scale of the deaths in Andijan and the subsequent deterioration in the human-rights situation in Uzbekistan as well as the continued refusal by the Uzbek authorities to cooperate with and address the concerns of the international community, including the United Nations, required the General Assembly to address the issue.

30. **Mr. Hamidon** (Malaysia) said that his delegation continued to oppose country-specific resolutions and reiterated its support for the declaration adopted by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, meeting in Doha, Qatar, in June

2005, in which they had stated that human-rights issues must be addressed through a constructive, dialogue-based approach with respect for national sovereignty, non-interference in internal affairs, impartiality, non-selectivity and transparency (A/59/880, para. 27). His delegation called on the sponsors of such draft resolutions to cease the practice of "naming and shaming", which was counterproductive and contributed to polarization among Member States.

31. **Mr. Cumberbatch Miguén** (Cuba) said that the proposed draft resolution had nothing to do with the promotion and protection of human rights at the international level. The sponsors of such draft resolutions against developing countries were motivated by geopolitical concerns and never submitted similar draft resolutions to address their own human-rights violations. Their use of inquisitorial methods, double standards and politicization of human rights had undermined the work of the Commission on Human Rights and would doom the Human Rights Council to failure. His delegation would oppose the draft resolution and any other efforts to manipulate the United Nations human-rights machinery.

32. **Ms. Ataeva** (Turkmenistan) said that, as a member of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) and the Organization of the Islamic Conference (OIC), her Government opposed the practice of targeting Member States through country-specific resolutions, which had led to the politicization of the United Nations human-rights machinery and had made the Commission on Human Rights ineffective. The promotion and protection of human rights required dialogue and cooperation. Her delegation was concerned that members of NAM and OIC were increasingly the targets of such resolutions, which hindered cooperation and led to confrontation among Member States. She called on delegations to end the practice of naming and shaming developing countries.

33. **Ms. García-Matos** (Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela) reiterated her delegation's opposition to the selective condemnation of individual developing countries for human-rights violations and deplored the fact that country-specific draft resolutions continued to be submitted for consideration by the Committee, which diverted its attention from efforts to enhance cooperation in human rights. Moreover, Uzbekistan had demonstrated its desire to cooperate in that field, as was indicated in paragraph 1 of the draft resolution. Her delegation was particularly concerned that such

politicized draft resolutions continued to be put forward at a time when Member States were seeking to reform the Organization and establish a new human-rights body. Therefore, her delegation would vote against the draft resolution.

34. **Mr. Swe** (Myanmar), supporting the declaration adopted by the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of the Non-Aligned Movement (A/59/880, annex), said that human rights should not be used as instruments of political pressure, especially against the non-aligned countries and other developing countries, as stated by the Heads of State or Government of the non-aligned countries in October 1995. His delegation would therefore vote against the draft resolution and, as a matter of principle, would stand in solidarity with Uzbekistan.

35. **Mr. Vohidov** (Uzbekistan) said that the stage had already been set and the roles assigned for those who would do the "beating" and those who would be "beaten". He asked whether any country was in a position to judge others. He called on the sponsors to examine themselves and their own records. Similar resolutions had never garnered more than one third of the vote. In various regional and international forums, countries had opposed resolutions targeting individual States. However, they tended to change their positions in the General Assembly owing to political pressure. No one had the right to thwart the decisions of entire organizations or groups of countries on the basis of unilateral interests. The naming and shaming of individual countries in such resolutions concerned the entire international community. All Member States were thereby shamed, as any one of them could be targeted at any moment for political reasons. As a matter of principle, such country-specific resolutions should not be considered. Rather, countries should be given the opportunity to work with specialized agencies without being subjected to the politicization that had prevailed within the Committee.

36. Although the draft resolution was very weak and groundless, it was also harmful as it distorted the facts and hindered his Government's ability to defend constitutional order. The language used made it appear that his Government had acted against peaceful demonstrators. The draft resolution made no mention of the criminal groups involved which were carrying out terrorist acts. Hundreds of armed persons had occupied military and civilian facilities, taken hostages and killed scores of people.

37. As the draft resolution was unjust and based on untrue information, and undermined the credibility of the Committee's work, he called for adjournment of debate under rule 116 of the rules of procedure. His delegation also called on others, especially delegations which had previously abstained from voting on similar draft resolutions, to support Uzbekistan.

38. *Mr. Butagira (Uganda) took the Chair.*

39. **The Chairman** invited two representatives to speak in favour of, and two against, the motion, before putting it to the vote in accordance with rule 116.

40. **Mr. Dapkiunas** (Belarus) said that delegations which viewed no-action motions as a tool for silencing open discussion on human rights were mistaken. Such motions were a measure of last resort for countries which could not make themselves heard and preferred to engage in debate along the principles of fair treatment and respectful dialogue. Country resolutions on human rights did indeed work — they served to promote the domestic agendas of Governments initiating such resolutions and to estrange Member States which fell prey to the deplorable practice of naming and shaming.

41. The arrogant tactics of exerting undue pressure on sovereign Governments thwarted any engagement with them from the outset. Country-specific resolutions created a dangerous illusion of addressing human rights simply and easily. Governments had the right to criticize others for human-rights abuses. It was quite a different matter, however, when such criticism came in the guise of a rubber-stamp decision of a respectable multilateral body. Given that some members were eager to draw and perpetuate the lines of division from a past era within the General Assembly, the chances of creating a fair and strong Human Rights Council for new times were slim.

42. The promotion of human rights was always the result of painstaking work and advocacy, with the involvement of the Government concerned and with due respect for its sovereign authority. Country-specific resolutions undermined the promotion of human rights. He therefore called on delegations to vote in favour of the motion.

43. **Mr. Xie Bohua** (China) said that his delegation supported the no-action motion. No human-rights situation was perfect. The international community must address the issue of the promotion and protection

of human rights through constructive dialogue and cooperation. It was regrettable that some Governments appointed themselves human-rights arbiters and used country-specific resolutions to name and shame developing countries. The sponsors of such resolutions, however, maintained silence about gross human-rights violations in their own countries. Such double standards and selectivity would only increase confrontation in the area of human rights.

44. **Ms. Hart** (Canada) expressed opposition to procedural motions used to stifle debate on serious human-rights concerns. Addressing such issues was one of the Committee's main tasks. In addition to focusing on human-rights norms, the Committee should ensure that obligations were met and send a signal to the international community that it would consider the substance of human-rights issues put before it.

45. **Mr. Jones Parry** (United Kingdom), speaking on behalf of the European Union; the acceding countries Bulgaria and Romania; the candidate countries Croatia and Turkey; the stabilization and association process countries Albania, Serbia and Montenegro and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia; and, in addition, Iceland and the Republic of Moldova, said that the motion was a procedural device that undermined transparency and freedom of expression and should be rejected as a matter of principle. In view of the universality and interdependence of human rights, no State, large or small, was above being judged by international human-rights forums, and in particular the General Assembly. The claim about double standards could mean that the international community should never address even the gravest human-rights abuses.

46. The human-rights situation in Uzbekistan must be dealt with within the current year. The draft resolution recognized the minimum positive steps that the Government of Uzbekistan had taken in the past year, but since April 2005 serious human-rights violations had occurred in Andijan, freedom of expression had been restricted and independent civil society, including human-rights defenders, had been harassed. The Government had failed to take the necessary steps to improve the human-rights situation, turned down offers of assistance and refused to cooperate with the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, various United Nations bodies and other international organizations. The Committee should address

substance, urge the Government of Uzbekistan to implement its international commitments and make clear to Uzbek civil society that the international community was aware of its plight.

47. *A recorded vote was taken on the motion for adjournment of debate.*

In favour:

Afghanistan, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belize, Bhutan, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Fiji, Gambia, Guinea, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Maldives, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Oman, Pakistan, Philippines, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sudan, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Turkmenistan, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

Against:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Tonga, Turkey, Tuvalu, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Vanuatu.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Brazil, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Iraq, Kenya, Mali, Mauritius, Nauru, Niger, Nigeria, Rwanda, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay.

48. *The motion was rejected by 75 votes to 65, with 28 abstentions.*

49. **The Chairman** stated that a recorded vote would be taken on draft resolution A/C.3/60/L.51, as orally revised.

Statements in explanation of vote before the voting

50. **Mr. Taranda** (Belarus), said that Belarus was against resolutions on human rights in specific countries or groups of countries because such texts politicized United Nations human-rights mechanisms and distracted the Committee. A selective approach and double standards had become a norm for the Commission on Human Rights, which every year adopted the same resolutions on a number of countries where the human-rights situation was no worse than elsewhere, while some members of the Commission failed to react appropriately on behalf of the international community to massive human-rights violations in other countries.

51. In various parts of the world, including countries where democracy was highly developed, human rights faced challenges related inter alia to increased racial intolerance and xenophobia, the activity of extremist groups, trafficking in human beings, the situation of refugees and immigrants and the activity of terrorist organizations. Criticism of individual countries could neither hide nor resolve those problems. Consideration of human-rights issues should be based on mutual respect, dialogue and cooperation.

52. The approach taken by the sponsors was not conducive to establishing human-rights mechanisms supported by the Member States. In solidarity with Uzbekistan, Belarus called upon the initiators of country-specific resolutions to review their approach.

53. **Mr. Degia** (Barbados) said that human-rights issues must be approached on the basis of dialogue and cooperation. No country had an unblemished record

and therefore no particular State should be targeted. Although opposed to country-specific resolutions, Barbados was gravely concerned about the pattern of human-rights abuses in many parts of the world. All States should cooperate to address those issues through dialogue.

54. **Mr. Pak Tek Hun** (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) said that geopolitical and other national interests of certain countries and groups of countries should not be disguised as concern for human rights. Uzbekistan was entitled to safeguard its national sovereignty, constitutional order and territorial integrity. Accordingly, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea would vote against the draft resolution.

55. **Mr. Saeed** (Sudan) rejected attempts to politicize human rights in order to settle old scores and pursue specific political agendas. Targeting developing countries selectively stood in the way of human-rights reforms and consultations on the establishment of the Human Rights Council, which should remedy the ills that undermined the work of the Commission on Human Rights and establish respect for national sovereignty, transparency and ethics. Applying double standards was one of those ills. The Sudan would vote against the draft resolution.

56. **Mr. Nikiforov** (Russian Federation) said that the human-rights situation in Uzbekistan did not warrant the draft resolution, which was a political step and did not aim at promoting human rights in that country. Instead of focusing on country-specific situations, the Committee should consider essential human-rights issues. Accordingly, the Russian Federation would vote against the draft resolution.

57. **Ms. Ataeva** (Turkmenistan) said that the draft resolution was of a political nature. Country-specific resolutions led to confrontation. Their sponsors failed to see their own shortcomings. Turkmenistan favoured honest dialogue and cooperation based on mutual respect and would vote against the draft resolution.

58. **Mr. Vohidov** (Uzbekistan) said that the assertion that Uzbekistan showed no willingness to cooperate with the international community on human-rights issues did not correspond to reality. Uzbekistan was cooperating with the Commission on Human Rights under the 1503 procedure (see Commission resolution 2000/3) and had proposed to the main sponsors to work within the Commission on an investigation into the

events in Andijan. However, Uzbekistan's readiness to cooperate on the issue of human rights was ignored, while bilateral contacts were used to ensure the adoption of the draft resolution, whose text had not been shown to the Uzbek delegation beforehand. The sponsors simply wanted Uzbekistan to yield to bilateral pressure.

59. The draft resolution was baseless and a mere political device. Such resolutions could be introduced in relation to any country, not in order to promote human rights but with a view to affecting its political situation and preventing it from protecting its constitutional order. The preceding vote had already created a confrontational atmosphere that would persist during discussions about the reform of human-rights mechanisms.

60. *A recorded vote was taken.*

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Palau, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Timor-Leste, Turkey, Tuvalu, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu.

Against:

Afghanistan, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Gambia, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Mauritania, Morocco, Myanmar, Oman, Pakistan, Qatar, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Sudan, Syrian

Arab Republic, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, United Arab Emirates, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

Abstaining:

Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Belize, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Central African Republic, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Iraq, Jamaica, Kenya, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Mali, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia, Nauru, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Togo, Tonga, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia.

61. *The draft resolution was adopted by 73 votes to 38, with 58 abstentions.*

The meeting rose at 12.25 p.m.